

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 20, 2004. Claims 1 and 3 to 37 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 7, 26, 29, 32 and 35 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action contended that the phrase “the electrical power supply” lacked sufficient antecedent basis. In this regard, the subject matter of Claim 2 has been incorporated into Claim 1 and has been amended to read “an amount of electrical power supplied”. Accordingly, Claim 2 has been cancelled. Based on this amendment to Claim 1, the amended phrase “the electrical power supplied” in Claim 4 is believed to have sufficient antecedent basis. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 8, 10 to 13, 15, 16, 21 to 23 and 25 to 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,894 (Mitchell). Claims 3, 9, 14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mitchell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,352 (Zavracky). Claims 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mitchell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,275 (Horvitz). The foregoing actions were taken without prejudice of disclaimer of subject matter and without conceding the correctness of the rejections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 15-24, 26-28, and 32-34

The present invention relates to a personal information terminal for connecting to a network and receiving information from the network. The received information is displayed on a data display means which includes an enlarging optical system. One aspect of the present invention lies in the conservation of electrical power. More specifically, the present invention limits the amount of electrical power supplied to the data display means during a time in which information is being obtained from the network.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 recites a personal information terminal comprising, data display means including an enlarging optical system, input means for receiving instructions from a user; and wireless communication means for wirelessly connecting to a network. The personal information terminal further comprises control means for obtaining information from the network through the wireless communication means and for displaying the information on the data display means, based on instructions from the input means. In addition, the control means limits an amount of electrical power supplied to the data display means to an amount less than an amount at a normal time while the control means is obtaining the information from the network through the wireless communication means.

Independent Claims 26 and 32 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, the correspond generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 26 and 32, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature

of limiting an amount of electrical power supplied to the data display means to an amount less than an amount at a normal time while information is obtained from the network through the wireless communication means.

Mitchell relates to a system for providing maintenance instructions to a user at a remote location. The system includes a wearable computer 102 and display unit 108 that can receive display signals from the computer for visual display. The system also includes a user input device by which the user enters commands to the computer, and a wireless remote communications node 128 for connection with peripheral devices.

In the rejection of now-cancelled Claim 2, the Office Action asserted that Mitchell teaches the feature of limiting an amount of electrical power supplied to the data display means to an amount less than an amount at a normal time while information is obtained from the network. Applicants respectfully disagree, as Mitchell is not seen to suggest that electrical power is limited while information is obtained from the network. Mitchell is merely seen to teach that “the video connection is at the control of the user and activated as needed”, and that the user can disconnect and close the CSC connection or shutdown the system (column 15, lines 48-52; column 16, lines 49 to 59). Such operations are different from the claim language, which specifies that an amount of electrical power supplied to the data display means is limited to an amount less than that at a normal time while information is being obtained from a network through wireless communication means.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Zavracky and Horvitz, is not seen to supply what is missing from Mitchell. Accordingly, Claims 1, 26 and 32 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 7-14, 25, 29-31, 35-37

According to another aspect of the present invention, the personal information terminal provides a notification to a user that information is being obtained from the network. This notification is made by a notification means which is arranged outside the display window. In this way, a user need not look into the display window to obtain a status of the network connection of the personal information terminal.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 7 recites a personal information terminal comprising an ocular-type data display means arranged within a display window and having an enlarging optical system, input means for receiving instructions from a user, wireless communication means for wirelessly connecting to a network, and control means for obtaining information from the network through the wireless communication means and for making the information be displayed on the ocular-type data display means, based on instructions from the input means. The personal information terminal further comprises notification means for providing a notification to a user at least as to whether the control means is in a state of obtaining information from the network through the wireless communication means, wherein the notification means is arranged outside the display window.

Independent Claims 29 and 35 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, the correspond generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 7.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 7, 29 and 35, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of providing a notification to a user at least as to whether the control means is in a state of obtaining information from the network through the wireless communication means, wherein the notification means is arranged outside the display window.

Mitchell is seen to teach that the “Find” function will activate a pop-up window that allows a user to speak or type a word they wish to find (column 14, lines 8-18). The “Find” function searches an active HTML page for the requested word and highlights it if it is found. The Office Action contends that Mitchell’s pop-up window of the “Find” function corresponds to the present invention’s notification means.

However, the “Find” function is not seen to disclose or suggest notification as to whether a control means is in a state of obtaining information from a network through a wireless communication means, as the currently amended claims now recite. Mitchell is merely seen to teach a pop-window for a word search, and a word search is not the same as an information transfer during wireless communication. Furthermore, Mitchell is not seen to teach that the notification means is arranged outside the display window. The Office Action stated that the pop-up window is arranged outside an HTML page, but there is no support found for this in Mitchell. Mitchell merely states that ““Find” will activate a pop-up window allowing the user to speak or type the word they wish to find.” (column 14, lines 8-18). Mitchell makes no mention where the pop-up window is

arranged with respect to a display window, muchless that the pop-up window is arranged outside of a display window which contains therein an ocular-type data display means.


The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Zavracky and Horvitz, is not seen to supply what is missing from Mitchell. Accordingly, Claims 7, 29 and 35 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. O'Neill", written over a horizontal line.

Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 87692v1